DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 713 HE 027 797

AUTHOR Wenzel, Stacy A.; Hollenshead, Carol
TITLE Tenured Women Faculty: Reasons for Leaving One Research University. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (19th, Tucson, AZ, November 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Mobility; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Interviews; Job Satisfaction; Labor Turnover; National Surveys; Research Universities; *Sex Bias; Sex Discrimination; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Persistence; *Tenured Faculty; *Women Faculty; Work Environment
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

In an effort to understand how higher education institutions can retain women faculty members, this study examined the attitudes of eight tenured women faculty who chose to leave one research university. Some went to other tenured academic positions, others to research agencies. Interviews included open-ended questions as well as focused probes concerning key factors. In addition, the study examined data from the Carnegie 1989 national college faculty survey analyzing the responses of 367 women and 1,749 men who held full-time tenured positions. Findings revealed that there were aspects of the environment at the university that made the women interviewed choose to leave. They described experiences and incidences where their career opportunities were blocked, where others treated them with disrespect, where they had too little personal or financial support, where salary was inequitable, where the university did not help with dual career issues, and where personal and institutional goals were mismatched. A significant number of these negative experiences were related to gender. Results from the analysis of the national survey supported the finding that aspects of the faculty work environment are important factors in decisions to leave an institution. (Contains 31 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 713

Tenured women faculty: Reasons for leaving one research university

Stacy A. Wenzel

Carol Hollenshead

Center for the Education of Women
330 E. Liberty
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

HE 027 797

Not for citation, quotation or reproduction without written permission of authors

Presented at the
Annual Conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education,
November 9-12, 1994, Tucson, Arizona.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Doubletree Hotel, Tucson, Arizona, November 10-13, 1994. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Research paper abstract--ASHE 1994

Tenured women faculty: Reasons for leaving one research university

Despite increases in the proportion of Ph.D.s awarded to women in the last two decades and efforts by research universities to increase the recruitment and hiring of women, progress in increasing women's representation among tenured faculty continues to be slow. While universities regularly collect and analyze data concerning hiring of faculty, little has been done to increase our understanding of the complex set of factors that influence retention of tenured women faculty. To help close this gap, we offer the results of a qualitative analysis of interviews with former tenured women faculty from one research university. We complement this qualitative data with statistical analysis (ANOVA and Multivariate regression) of 1989 national faculty survey findings on women and men tenured faculty. From this study, we gain a better understanding of why women faculty voluntarily leave a tenured position

Despite increases in the proportion of Ph.D.s awarded to women in the last two decades and efforts by research universities to increase the recruitment and hiring of women, progress in increasing women's representation among tenured faculty continues to be slow. While universities regularly collect and analyze data concerning hiring of faculty, little has been done to increase our understanding of the complex set of factors that influence retention of women faculty. To help close this gap, we offer the results of a qualitative analysis of interviews with women who voluntarily left their tenured faculty positions at one research university and the statistical analysis of a national sample of tenured women and men. From this study, we gain a better understanding of why tenured women faculty voluntarily leave and what this suggests for institutional practice and for future research.

The problem: Too few tenured women

The statistics reveal the problem. Women remain segregated at the assistant professor rank, comprising over 32% of assistant professors since 1979. Yet in 1989, they made up only 26.3% of associate and 13.6% of full professors (Carter & Wilson, 1992:65). Institutional and cohort studies at research universities offer evidence that women disproportionately are denied tenure and voluntarily leave their faculty positions. For example, one institutional study finds that women assistant professors are less likely than male assistant professors to receive tenure. In addition, women instructors are less likely than male instructors to be given the associate professor rank. Women of color are even less likely to be awarded tenure than other faculty (Hollenshead, 1994). In a cohort of untenured faculty appointed between 1973 and 1982 (Feldt, 1985), productive women were more likely than male peers to not be promoted and to transfer out of the tenure track and into research scientist positions. In a larger cohort group from this same time frame, Feldt (1990) documents that significant numbers of untenured women are departing and being terminated despite their potential and their success in publishing. Other studies show that women faculty are tenured at lower rates than male peers and are more likely to leave voluntarily (Johnsrud, Atwater, Ikeda, & Goodman, 1991, 1993; Rausch, Ortiz, Douthitt, & Reed, 1989).

Faculty leave institutions for many and complex reasons. For probationary faculty, it is difficult to separate how the tenure process and more general conditions interact in influencing their decision to voluntarily leave a position. Learning from probationary faculty is a critical research concern.[1] However, in this investigation, we turn to the specific question of <u>why</u> faculty women voluntarily leave a <u>tenured</u> position either to move to another university or pursue a non-university career. To better understand departmental and campus climate, the tenured woman is a great source of insight. Having gained tenure and proven her competency as a scholar, the descriptions that the tenured woman gives of her environment can be more convincing to administrators who might dismiss comments from probationary faculty as coming from someone who has not measured up.

There are other reasons for focusing on tenured faculty women. First, in order to promote a more diverse faculty, some campuses are instituting programs aimed at hiring more tenured women faculty. For a campus to utilize these kinds of initiatives, they need to understand why a tenured woman would want to leave her current academic position. A campus that does not wish to lose its tenured women faculty to other schools would need to know what

---

[1] The only tenured woman who we contacted and who declined to participate in our study, actually noted that she thought that we should look at issues concerning probationary women faculty instead of concerns of tenured women who leave. We are currently conducting interviews with untenured women faculty who have left a research university.

provokes or entices tenured women faculty to leave and then develop a plan to counter these factors. Second, tenured women faculty have beat incredible odds to gain their position. It is important to learn how they have worked within the challenges of their field and institution to achieve. While current tenured women faculty have been the focus of some study, the view of tenured women faculty who have left an institution will provide additional insight. Third, tenured women faculty are rare, especially in certain fields, and scattered across departments and institutions. Studies of this group can perhaps serve as a conduit by which tenured women faculty can share their understanding of the issues that concern them and assist each other as they deal with their environment as individuals and collectively. One can speculate about tenured women's experiences based on studies of tenured women still in academia, current and former untenured women faculty, and general faculty mobility (e.g., Amey, 1993; Boice, 1992; Burke, 1987; Jensen, 1982; Johnsrud & Wunsch, 1991; Rothblum, 1988; Ruskus, Williamson, & Kelley, 1993; Sorcinelli, 1993; Weiler, 1985). However, only a few studies specifically learn from tenured women who have left a given university or academe (e.g., Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Rausch, Ortiz, Douthitt, & Reed, 1989). Our study can help fill a gap in this literature.

Research design: The 'why's'

Wolcott (1992) makes a good point that too often educational researchers, when they discuss their choices of research methods, take the approach of defending the 'shortcomings' of their methods--missing the chance to talk about the ideas that drive their work. His point challenges us to state our assumptions and how they influenced our inquiry methods. We undertook this study with a goal to answer the question, 'why would tenured women faculty leave their position at a university?' Our methods were selected to fit this question.

We know that women leave an academic institution for a variety of reasons--both good and bad. With regard to reasons seen as negative, we hope that our research findings can provide institutions with the information they need to eliminate these types of influences.

We also espouse the perspective that women's career attainment cannot be truly understood by looking at their individual traits (i.e., whether personality or early socialization). We agree with numerous scholars who focus on a more sociological explanation of the experiences of women in the workplace (e.g., Acker, 1988; Harding, 1992; Kanter, 1977). Therefore, since we think some of the reasons for leaving are within the environment of the workplace and thus the control of leaders in universities, we want our research to facilitate institutional change. To facilitate change in educational institutions, we believe a necessary though not sufficient criteria is that our findings be credible and powerfully expressed.

Because of our belief in the 'strong objectivity of women's standpoint' (Harding,1993), we go to those who can best tell us why tenured women would leave--tenured women who left. It seems too obvious to need justification, but some critics would suggest that those who left are too close to the situation to see the 'truth.' This leads us into another assumption--we are concerned with how women who left see the factors affecting them.

Based on these assumptions, we chose as our primary research method to interview women who voluntarily left tenured faculty positions at one research university. Some of our informants went to other tenured academic positions, others to prestigious research agencies. We use exit interviews with open-ended questions as well as focused probes concerning the factors that we suspect to be influential--namely forces within the university work environment like collegial interactions. We approached our analysis with an inductive perspective and allowed the issues important to the departed faculty to emerge out of the data, rather than impose any theory of what ideas would emerge. Our inductive

approach is also why we set up our interview schedule so informants could talk freely about why they left before we asked about particular areas that the research literature names as influences. Numerous researchers confirm our view that qualitative analysis of the narratives of study participant offers advantages when looking for complex factors that influence an individual's life and the individual's interpretation of these factors (e.g., Bryman, 1988:95; Caldwell, 1985:46-57; Zeller, 1993:100-103).

While some higher education leaders and faculty call for the use of exit interviews (e.g., Vandell and Fishbein, 1989), skeptics think that exit interviews with faculty fail to solicit complete and accurate information. One faculty member (not an interview informant in our study) with whom we spoke, wary of the use of exit interviews, explained that former faculty do not want to burn bridges and upset their former department peers by saying anything negative about their experience. Because faculty who leave a university often remain in the same profession, they need to continue to work with former colleagues who serve on review boards and committees that may be able to assist them in the future. With this understanding, we designed our exit interviews to minimize the risk to the participants and with the goal to show that these interviews could still provide useful information that can inform institutional change. To minimize risk to informants, interviews were conducted and informant identities known to only the interviewer who has no connections to the academic units, university administration or professional communities in which the informants work. Access was facilitated and support provided for this study through a women's center on the campus that these women left. This center's good reputation further assured the informants that their confidence would not be betrayed and their identities would be protected.

We also recognize the value of using quantitative analysis from the perspective that it is understood and valued by policymakers many of whom have yet to be convinced that qualitative research is valid. Survey research can provide contextual multivariate analyses of people's experiences (Jayratne & Stewart, 1991:93). As we made our design decisions, we took notice of the argument that whenever possible, it is best to use a research design that uses both qualitative and quantitative methods to help prove the validity of findings (e.g., Eisner, 1991). Some even have gone so far as to define a valid research finding as one dependent on multiple methods (e.g., Zeller, 1993:109). Yet our quantitative portion of the study was not designed to answer our main research question or 'triangulate' our findings from our qualitative analysis, but rather to complement our primary findings from interviews.

> At the extremes, advocates of the integration of methods assume that triangulation offers the opportunity to increase the 'internal validity' of the data. In contrast, those who favour complementarity recognize that data are constituted by the method which elicits them and that different data sets do not add up to some rounded unity (Brannen, 1992).

At the end of this paper, we will discuss the effectiveness of our statistical analyses of national survey data as complement to our principle interview study.

Research design: The 'how's'

Eight former associate and full professors from one major research university, which we will refer to as X University, participated in our study. Four participated during during October and November 1993 and four during June and July 1994. The fall 1993 group were contacted as part of a pilot study conducted to learn the viability of exit interviews. They were identified as recently departed former tenured women by key contact persons at their university. We interviewed them by phone. We also contacted another woman as part of this pilot study but she chose not to participate. Based on the success in both gaining the participation of former tenured women faculty and the richness of their interviews, we

received funding to conduct a larger scale study interviewing both untenured and tenured women faculty who left this university. This summer 1994 study used the same interview schedule as the pilot study. Participants were identified through official channels. A senior administrator at the university cooperating in this study solicited from each X University school and college the names and current locations of tenured and untenured women faculty who left their positions (not including those denied tenure) during the 1992-93 and 1993-94 academic years. All of those contacted agreed to participate. It has not been possible to reach some women by phone or set up all interviews as of this date. One participant, a former tenured associate professor included in this study, agreed to participate by written response to questions after the interview schedule.

Interviews were conducted by telephone, tape recorded (with the permission of participants), and transcribed. Six transcripts along with the written survey from one participant and the notes from the interview with one informant (during whose interview the tape recorder malfunctioned) were analyzed to identify common themes in the reasons participants gave for why they left. In the semi-structured interviews, the interviewer asked the participants why they left their positions. Participants explained their reasons and the interviewer probed to clarify their comments. The interviewer then explored specific reasons for departures, drawn from findings of past studies (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Amey, 1993; Brown, 1967; Burke, 1987; Farnsworth & Toombs, 1988; Olsen, 1993; Rothblum, 1988; Stecklein & Lathrop, 1960; Weiler, 1985). These include the availability of resources, salary, opportunity for advancement, workload, interactions with colleagues, discrimination and family issues. They were also asked what their former University could have done differently to keep them. The interview guideline is included in Appendix 1.

To analyze the information provided to us, we paid careful attention to both the audio taped interviews and their transcriptions. One of us (Wenzel) conducted all of the interviews and listened to the audio tapes numerous times. Both authors independently reviewed transcripts. In our analysis we identified key issues mentioned by our informants. In addition, we revisited our analysis, attending specifically to the urgings of feminist scholars like Devault (1990) who caution that language often does not neatly describe women's experiences. With this in mind we looked and listened for where our informants expressed themselves ambiguously and looked for the messages between the lines.

In the quantitative analysis, we examine data available from the Carnegie 1989 national faculty survey.[2] We look at responses from tenured faculty women and men to see if the themes found in the interviews are useful in an analysis relating these themes to faculty opinions on leaving their positions. We attempt to answer questions of: How do tenured women in US universities answer questions about their work environment? Do tenured women differ from tenured men in these views? Do opinions on work environment show relationships with tenured faculty views on possibly leaving their profession?

We analyze the survey responses of 367 women and 1749 men who hold full-time tenured positions at US Research I to Carnegie I institutions. We ran crosstabulations of the responses to questions concerning leaving academe for the men and women, finding no noteworthy differences between these groups. Survey questions were examined and those

---

[2] In the 1989 Carnegie national faculty survey contacted college and university faculty during the spring of 1989. Based on Carnegie classification, institutions were randomly selected and their faculty were randomly sampled, stratified by program area. Of the 9,996 questionnaires mailed, 5,450 were returned for a 54.5% completion rate.

that corresponded to the themes expressed in the interviews were noted. Factor analysis was utilized to help find a number of underlying themes which we combined into scales. Reliabilities were also calculated. We named one scale 'I'M THINKING OF LEAVING' which combines the faculty member's thoughts about wanting to leave their position.

I would not become a college teacher again.	(positive=disagree)
I'm considering entering another line of work.	(positive=disagree)
I may leave profession in next 5 years.	(positive=disagree)
I often wish I entered another profession.	(positive=disagree)
I feel trapped in this profession.	(positive=disagree)
Have you ever considered permanent departure?	(positive=no)

These variables and scales and the scale 'I'M THINKING OF LEAVING' were then examined by analysis of variance between the women and men tenured faculty groups. The means are presented in Table 1 and those that are significantly different to the 0.01 level are indicated with an asterisk.

Next, we examined the relationship between the factors corresponding to themes found in the interviews and the outcome of how a faculty member thought about leaving their position, measured by the scale 'I'M THINKING OF LEAVING.' Multivariate regression analyses were run separately for women and men tenured faculty. Due to a large difference in the sample size of men and women, a random 30% sample of tenured men is used to keep the analyses comparable. The dependent variable is 'I'M THINKING OF LEAVING' with independent variables entered into the equation one at a time. The regression equations predicting faculty tendency to consider leaving their faculty position are summarized in Tables 2 and 3.

Primary findings: Exit interviews with departed tenured women faculty

This study benefits from the collected insights of eight talented and very different women. These informants, who left tenured positions at X University, shared their reasons for leaving with us were from 5 different schools and 8 different units within X University. Their stay at this university varied from 5 to 25 years and averaged around 13 years. Six were full professors and 2 associates. One of our informants is a woman of color; the others are Caucasian. Four indicated that they were married during their career at X University. Two mentioned having children and 2 said they were single.[3] All of the informants are currently employed at prestigious universities (5) or top research institutions outside academe (3). The two former associate professors are now professors and one of the informants is now the dean of her school.

Our interviews were social interactions between people, not just 'subjects' who supplied us with data and 'researchers' who collected the data. Oakley (1981) emphasizes the need to recognize this and comment on this as part of research findings. While we did not directly ask the women with whom we spoke how they felt about participating in the interviews, our sense is that the comfort level in talking about their experiences varied. A couple of the informants stated that they were not really concerned with concealing their identities and used names of their colleagues and discipline specific research areas in their conversation. Others were more guarded. They tended to not use names of people or discipline-specific jargon--even though we told them that in reports identifying characteristics would be changed. We did not pursue topics at length if we sensed informants did not want to elaborate. In fact, one interview was very short due to the discomfort that the interviewer perceived in the voice of the informant who also noted that she could talk only briefly. After interviewing each informant, our main feeling was that of gratitude for their candid

---

[3] We did not ask our informants directly about their family/marital status.

comments. We were also impressed by their commitment to their field and to higher education. Some of the informants asked: how we planned to use the study findings, what initiated the study, for the current situation at X University and at the women's center which was facilitating our work. A number of them offered to help out with future research if we planned to pursue certain questions of interest to them.

The characteristics and circumstances of each of our informants are unique and complex. Yet many shared common experiences and feelings pertaining to their decisions to leave X University. We cannot present our findings in a way that details the complexities of each informant's case as this would compromise our need to protect individuals' identities. Rather than attempt to present our findings by describing each individual as a case, we choose to look at common themes found in a number of their stories. We aim to identify, in their complexity, issues that tenured women faculty find important enough to influence them to leave. It is these issues that we believe institutional policymakers should be aware of and attend to improving. First, we detail key issues mentioned by informants. Then, we discuss more general findings of this study.

Opportunity

A number (6) of our informants expressed frustration that their efforts to work effectively as researchers, teachers and in service of the University community were blocked by those with more power. This was a major reason for leaving given by three informants and noted by three others.

We are struck by the level of our informants' frustration in being denied a chance to contribute--in their service to the university community and through their research. One informant noted

> That perhaps is the saddest thing for us, the women who do leave, is if we believe that we haven't really made the difference we hoped we would make.

Another elaborated on what she meant when she said she found opportunities lacking at her former university and why she left for her new position.

> Well, I think that the new position that I have visibly is a very unique one, and it was an advancement in my career. I think that one looks for an advancement in one's career under any circumstances, but especially when one has the feeling of not being able to make any significant advancements or experience growth in the institution where they are. And I went to X University to direct my program there and worked very hard on that. I think it is a very excellent program. But as time went on, I noticed that I was really not asked to do very much committee work. I was not encouraged to sit on study sections. And when I inquire about some of these issues there were no answers provided. So I really felt that I would not be able to either learn new skills, developing farther than where I was. As a matter of fact I was not really even encouraged or promoted to have some participation which I felt would be appropriate for my level of experience, and expertise. And I think that the women at X University at my school are in general experiencing the same kinds of things women experience in academia everywhere. And there are the same lack of encouragement of further growth, lack of opportunities for participation, advancement, of real meaningful contributions ...

Another informant was very dissatisfied with her unit chair's management style, citing this as one of her top reasons for leaving. Among other things, she felt he undermined her work as chair of a key unit committee.

Another informant noted

> I guess I would say that I chose both to leave X University and to come to the University of N. The reasons aren't totally usually exclusive. I choose to come to the University of N because of some things that were lacking, some opportunities that were lacking for me at X University.

While opportunity in terms of contribution to the university or to knowledge was often mentioned, so too was opportunity in terms of promotion. Four of the informants described accounts of their own delayed or denied promotion or told of inequitable standards for promotion between women and men. While this was a partial contributor to decisions to leave for two informants, it did not cause others to leave.

One professor left after being told that she had no opportunity for advancement to a senior administrative post due to her supposedly 'abrasive' manner. Having obtained a reputation as an activist for women, she attributes her lack of opportunity to the fact that

> ... no one wants to hear the truth about things that are going on. ... In my opinion, the few women who I knew of, even outside of my immediate colleagues in my school who were very good at what they did, obtained training for management positions and were never utilized in those positions in the university and so they left.
> ...I believe it was the culture of the school that if a woman was competent and assertive that she was not appreciated. They really expected women to be the kind who would follow and salute the flag and say whatever it was that management wanted. They wanted 'yes-women.' They did not want women who believed that they could help the University and that believed that they knew how to accomplish that. I am being very frank with you, but that's my assessment of it and that is the reason I left.

Other informants echoed her concern that women faculty as a group were ready for, but were denied the leadership roles they sought within the University.

> ... I think that women wish to be engaged in activities that they feel are very important to their school, their university, their community and so on. And I think that they bring to the whole environment a different approach to problems and different experiences, different priorities, different sensitivities, and it is a very unsatisfactory feeling to feel that none of that is utilized or appreciated.

Some of our informants were active in lobbying for reform, but were not pleased with the University response to their request for equitable opportunities for women faculty.

> I and some colleagues wrote a letter to our dean to point out to him ... there was a much higher rate at which men or faculty members were being tenured in the hard sciences than in either the social sciences or the humanities. Because women are more often in the social sciences and the humanities, that this is, in effect, a hidden form of discrimination against women. .... That was met with total derision.

Respect

Four of our informants left X University because of the respect they were not given. One informant repeatedly said that her department chairperson 'did not take her seriously' and illustrated this through various examples. Another departed faculty member felt that lack of respect for her and other women came from the university as well as the unit level. She

expressed extreme frustration with the University's treatment of her both when she was at the institution and now that she has left.

> I think it is very clear why women like myself have left. I devoted my whole life. I can say I gave the best years of my life to a university who threw them back at me--who didn't really care. I think that that is a very damning thing to say about a place. I think X University had been noted as a very cold place.
> ... But in the end, I think that maybe it gets so caught up in all kinds of extraneous things that it has to do, that it really can't pay attention to its own people.
> ... I just feel they don't really look at the people who they do have properly. I don't believe they do appreciate the competent women they have. Once anyone leaves, it is like you don't exist except when they come around and ask for funds. I think that that is absolutely wrong. If they really cared about you as an individual they would try to follow up with what you accomplished after you leave or whatever. But they don't do that.

Another notes

> And as I say for years and years and years, I was really ...I was not liked, I was not appreciated. I was not considered an important person in the field. So, it was a very depressing place to work. Which you might understand...it was wonderful to come to a place where people were just...couldn't stand the excitement of having gotten me.
> .... I would go visit other universities and find, to my amazement, that my written works were required readings in courses. There were questions about my works on people's qualifying exams and so on. I felt that in my own department, nobody read my stuff. Nobody assigned it. Nobody thought it was important.

Our informants talked about individuals who didn't show them respect, didn't appreciate them or failed to take them seriously. Several faculty members spoke of these problems they faced in terms of running into pockets or neighborhoods of a resistant and hostile culture that produces the disrespect. This culture was difficult for all faculty, men included. Yet it was especially tough for women.

> Well as I said before, I see it as a whole, in a way, it is a very sort of a big testosterone macho kind of culture at that university generally. The sort of hard-ball, be a star, get the outside offers, and then you will get a new office. Otherwise, fuck you. No sense of: 'it's important to nurture junior faculty.' They sink or swim. They prove themselves. I think that in various ways, subtle and not so subtle, that particularly a system that is particularly unfriendly to women. So I sort of see the bad treatment that women get. There is a little extra twist that has to do with gender. Partly because I think that girls can't really play the boys ' game from the boys' point of view. But I think it is that whole way of running a university that I see as the fundamental issue that makes it such an unpleasant place. And there are departments I gather that have not really suffered as much and have had much warmer and more nurturing kinds of environments. ....
> So my sort of analysis is that you get this kind of male culture way of defining things. It is bad for everyone. It does not produce high morale. But it is especially bad for women.

Another talks about 'atmosphere' and 'tone' at X University.

> I think it is part of a larger atmosphere at X University that not only affects women, but affects everyone. I don't know if you are interviewing any men who have left or

men who have stayed for that matter. But over the years, there are just a lot...and even before I came to the University, I heard stories from people who I knew well that even sort of superstars who clearly were highly valued felt very unloved at the University, especially in my former department.

And there is a tone in the college that was really brought out in the open most clearly by a former dean ... He made this speech when he first became dean that we are only interested in hot shots here and they are the ones who are going to get rewarded. The fact of the matter is that X University is strong because it has got a lot of really solid work-a-day bench scientists so to speak--not a bunch of prima dona stars. It is not Harvard and in my opinion it is stronger because of it. But he was talking that if you are not about to get the Nobel Prize you can forget getting a salary raise or getting tenure or whatever. I think it just totally demoralized everyone and I think there was a feeling in general at the college level that the only thing that counted in getting promoted or getting tenure were your outside letters that sort of ... the esteem of your own colleagues didn't count for anything. Which is another way of saying that there was not respect for other people really in the upper echelon. I think the administration has been very unsupportive of two of my colleagues .... So I just think it is a very unsupportive kind of university, generally. And with women, my feeling is that it works doubly harshly.

Racism is another aspect of the discrimination that another of our informants faced. She notes that one of the reasons that lead her to leave was complicated by the racism that she and her spouse found in the community surrounding X University. She was disturbed by the hostility directed at recent immigrants--a hostility too clear to ignore when her husband's car tires were slashed.

Another informant had a very interesting comment on her view of 'discrimination.' She did not feel that she could attribute certain actions towards her as discriminatory. Yet the incidents she described are often cited as examples of discrimination.

[Interviewer] When you think back to being at your former university, do you recall anything that you would call discrimination towards you? Either blatant or more subtle that may have played into ...?

[Informant] No, I wouldn't say that I would recall anything terribly discriminatory to me personally. I think that some of the issues of not being able to advance along, and be the old boys network kind of thing, or sometimes being embarrassed by unreasonable criticisms that were made in meetings and so on. I would not take them as personally, as personal issues. I would just think that there are some individuals at X University that are just not very sensitive toward anyone, and if you happened to be in their way at a certain time then you're going to be the one who takes the insensitivity. And no one is interested in hearing about this and making a correction so it becomes a repetitive cycle. And so some younger staff members will then come and complain and be very bitter by their experiences. And you just say 'well that's how it is.'

Is the disrespect shown to tenured women faculty a symptom of the ignorance of individual members of the university community or of systemic cultural illness? Our informants talk about the causes of their experiences both ways.

Support

Support or lack of support from peers and administrators was another issue that emerged as

important from the stories of our informants. For one of our informants, it was the reason she left X University. She had put up with her lack of support for many years, but finally it was too much to take after one incident.

> I think over the years I had been unhappy with the support that I had gotten while I was on faculty there. For the amount of work that I did it seems the support just wasn't there. But that was not the real reason. The final reason had to do with an incident that occurred within my unit, in which I got absolutely no support. The incident was that, without, I don't want to go into all of the ins and outs because this was investigated by the University who did not really do anything about it.

We cannot describe the incident in detail because it would threaten the confidentiality of our informant. She told us

> I only told you this whole episode, and it is all supposedly documented in the records there and could be dug up and looked at. The only reason I told you is to give you an idea of some of the grossness of things that go on that don't get handled properly. How a person at the bottom--even a full professor at my former program which is not so far down and women full professors are not a dime a dozen--how you can be so completely trodden into the ground that you have no way of having any voice for yourself and you have no way of existing in a system like that.

As horrible as the incident was, she talks more about the reaction to this event by her peers and unit chairperson. After she reported the incident, she notes

> My chairperson tried to talk me into not reporting it and it was already too late. So then he tried to talk me into changing my story and he tried to talk the other female witnesses into changing their stories. And after that ensued a whole bunch of harassment from him and the male members of our department ...
>
> ...I basically told my chairperson when I went to leave, and he did ask me not to leave, that I did not really feel that I could work with that group of people who were so prejudice against women.

Other informants faced less dramatic situations and note a mixture of supportive and unsupportive peers and administrators. One informant described how one of her male colleagues and his wife helped her with some of her advocacy for women's rights at the University. She had friends who warned her to take care that her activism not harm her career opportunities--which it eventually did.

> Well, I was very active on the women's issues there. That really sealed the coffin for me. I was told when I started to do that by a gentleman friend in the department, that I shouldn't do it. He actually paid me a visit and said, 'Don't do this, this will affect everything that you do here.' And I said, my response was, 'well how can the truth be hurtful?' Anyway, it was interesting to me that when he retired, he came to see me and said how proud he was of me. That meant a lot to me.

On the other hand, not all of her peers were supportive of her.

> I think that within the department there were men who looked askance at what I was doing and felt that....in fact on one occasion I was told that, because I remained active in ...I was a key leader of a women's group ... I remained active at the time I had a sabbatical. Mind you, I was doing research on my sabbatical

> at half pay or whatever it was. I was told that if he had known I was going to continue that work, he never would have approved my sabbatical.

Another spoke of how she and another woman faculty member tried to support the salary increase of another woman in their unit. Still another informant relayed the story of how she joined her department and found that without any senior faculty in her research area, she had to work especially hard to get her peers to support her work and interests. In addition, she explained how she had to work to situate herself socially with her peers by inviting herself to lunch and reassuring them that women also can talk about sports. Her efforts gave her a chance at the lunchtime informal conversations with colleagues. Yet, she was still not an insider socially in a department where many of the faculty golfed together--a sport that she did not play. Another informant sees her unit's faculty as a troubled family.

> my peers were each, you know... it was sort of like if you had a whole family of siblings and they were all vying for the attention of the parent, which is the unit chair. So they are so busy, concerned about getting as much for themselves as they can that they could care less about supporting you.

She goes on to talk about support in not only a personal sense, but in the financial sense.

> And most instances, because..and I believe it was because they...I think it had a lot to do with them being male and me being female. A lot of the rest of it had to do with, as I was told, me being more resourceful. So when I was told no, I found other ways to do it and they just whined louder. So whatever reasons there was, almost all of the support for research in our unit went to the one research area. So we got in the area I worked in little support for any kind of... I never received any unit dollars for support the whole time I was there. And I indeed brought in money. I brought in contributions from industry that were put into a general fund and used for other people's support.

The lack of financial support for research or other resources were reasons for leaving given by two of our informants. One person notes

> I had approached the dean of my school on the potential for this new research and even had some funding that was coming in to begin the work. And he, the dean with whom I spoke at that time, in essence told me that I could go off and do this by myself if I wanted to, but my school was not really interested in it. Mind you, they have since become very interested in this. I was ahead of my time.

Another found that the University expected faculty to do too much administrative work and was "providing less staff support" with which to do this.

Though not noting these as key in their decision to leave, other informants spoke of their views on financial support and resources after we directly asked them about this in the interview. Some found X University's and their unit's resource and financial support very generous.

> No, I would contrast actually the resources that were available to me at X University with the ones that are available here, very favorably in X University's best interest. They supported faculty, including me, quite generously. Of course I did not have everything that I wanted, but my initial contract did include money for a research assistant. I had a research office and I have neither of those here. In terms of my unit chair responsibilities, I certainly--at the time and especially now--identify

> the resources that are available to faculty as pretty generous. They, in fact, help faculty shape themselves for competition in the outside world. So, I view those as very positive.

Another informant found resource support initially good, but then diminishing. She finds a connection with this and her more pressing concern that she lacked opportunities.

> Well, I think that what I was trying to picture to you was that when I was hired I went with two grants and a very active research program, and was given an adequate laboratory, and staff and started out just fine. But as the years went by it was the usual kind of thing. One was not really not given any thing more, or anything else, or being included in any planning for the future....

Salary

Salary is one influence on mobility according to studies of faculty who leave research institutions (Amey, 1993; Burke, 1987; Weiler, 1985). Like these studies, our conversations with former women tenured faculty from one research university reveal that while salary inequities were a source of irritation (five of the informants made negative comments on salary, two found them to be fine), other factors were more important in influencing their decisions to stay or leave. None of our informants said that salary was the primary reason she left X University. However, they discussed dissatisfaction with salary in a way that suggests it is a symptom of some of the other reasons for which they leave.

Our informants talked about being inequitably paid at X University for many years. They persisted despite recognizing this poor pay.

> ...I felt that for years I felt very unappreciated by my department. I was paid very poorly ...

> I was discriminated against even with respect to salary, which gets to mean a lot as you get older. The salary issue came up, in fact at my instigation. We were told that the University had to raise the salaries of women. That was a very hollow promise because when I went through ... in essence what was said was, well they don't have.... they don't have the money to do this. So they will give you small increments over the years and try to raise it up over the years. I was really shocked. I thought that affirmative action there was really hollow in their promises and certainly had no teeth.

> Yea, you know I could tell you ... there is a real big problem ... A real big problem ... For the nine years I was there, was paid a lower salary in spite of the fact that I was internationally better know than almost anybody in the group. I mean, there are many, many problems there related to women on the faculty.

Our informants relayed a number of stories describing <u>why</u> they found themselves earning less than they felt they should have. Gender bias seems to be a key.

> The salaries. I actually had my division chief, when I questioned why a male been hired at a lower rank than me was making a whole lot more than me... His answer to me, and swear to you this is the answer, was 'well your husband is a rich professional and you guys don't have any children. And he has many children to support and his wife doesn't work.' And I said, 'haven't you ever heard that is what the discrimination laws are all about, that it is his choice to marry someone who

> doesn't work and have many children. That you don't pay him a higher amount because of that.' And so at that point he tried to regroup because he realized that he said something that wasn't... but I never got equal pay, during the time I was there, to the male members of the division, NEVER!
> It wasn't until I left there that I got a salary that I should have gotten, and so...

One primary way a tenured faculty member can get much of a salary increase is to bring in an outside job offer according to the women with whom we spoke. One informant recounted a very personal example of how outside offers may yield benefits differently for men and for women.

> Let me tell you, I got an outside offer once, I got offered the directorship for a center at the University of Q. ... Because the university was trying to get me, they offered my husband (also a professor at X University) a sort of normal full professorship. And then we bargained with X University. I got nothing out of it basically. I got a 10% raise for the next year, which was not extraordinarily high by any means, but it was a hell of a lot higher than what I had been getting. The average had been around 4 or 5 % for the last few years. But I felt like my salary was way behind already. So that's all that I got. Then the following year when I was away on sabbatical and wrote 6 journal articles in one year, I was given a 2% raise. When I confronted the chairman about this he said, 'you better talk to your friend so and so who was on the executive committee cause he was one of the first ones arguing against giving you a big raise.' And I went to talk to this quote friend of mine and he said, 'well I felt it was unfair to give you such a big raise the year before.' So basically, I played the boys' game. I got my outside offer. I got my 10% raise out of it and it was immediately taken away from me. My husband meanwhile, who the University of Q didn't even really want, he got a big raise. He got a new computer, He got... I don't know all of the things. He went straight to the dean and dickered with him. Maybe, he just played the boys' game better than I did. But on the other hand, I think it is just the system that if you are not a boy then you are not going to be allowed to play the game. That infuriated me! Normally when someone got a 2% raise its done deliberately to them to tell them that your work stinks. Here I had this incredibly productive year and I get this 2% raise. It was just infuriating. I guess my feeling was, well, it is the usual signal to me from this department which is that they don't give a damn about my work.

The promise of increased salary was also an important issue during negotiations our informants had with X University in the midst of their leaving. We will discuss this in a later section.

Dual career issues

Three of the informants dealt with particular factors that contributed significantly to their leaving X University due to their circumstance of having a spouse with a career.

Two informants found the University was not helpful in assisting their spouses in obtaining adequate opportunities for employment. Contacts between their spouses and the University's assistance program for spouses were not followed up by the University personnel. One woman faculty member would have liked to have seen attempts made at introducing her spouse to University faculty in her spouse's field. For example, her husband was an engineer and because she was in another discipline she did not know engineering faculty for him to consult with. Another faculty member wished that the University would consider a spousal assistance program where university funds can be used to augment departmental budgets in order to hire faculty partners of women faculty.

It was not only difficulty in finding adequate jobs for spouses that inhibited the retention of the women in this study. They also talked of experiences where the chairs in their units made ungrounded assumptions about them because of their spousal situation. One chairperson assumed (which he later admitted) that our informant would automatically take her outside job offer to move near her husband in another state. Therefore, the chairperson did not make her a counter offer. She notes that she had already been in a commuting relationship with her husband for some time and would have liked to have had the option to stay at X University. She left however because she did not wish to deal with this type of treatment by her chairperson any longer. Another woman reports a similar situation where her department "didn't lift a finger to keep me" because of her change in marital status. In the previous section, we detailed the salary justification based on another informant's 'rich' husband.

One of the single women made an interesting comment.

> It (family) played a positive role in my decision to come to X University, but not much of a role in my decision to leave. I am a native of that part of the country, so I was pleased to be able to come back there and be near my family of origin. I don't have a husband or kids so dealing with a dual career marriage or the challenge of kids was not a problem, not a concern for me. It just wasn't an issue.

She later added

> I guess my sort of general comment is I think that the University does need to be more sensitive to women's issues, to women faculty's issues. I represent a small minority of professional, in that I am single and without children. My perspective, the feed back that I am giving you is limited to that perspective and I am really not like it to overshadow other feedback that you might get from women who are in dual career couples or who have children or family responsibilities in general.

Yet others, including a single mother and a married woman with no children, felt that their family situation had nothing to do with their decision to move.

> No, it did not. I am a single person. I have a son, and I am the single supporter of my family, and so I have certainly have looked for an environment that is going to good for my family, my child. And I think the area around X University was fine and housing is a little expensive. It was a fine city, and I did not have that kind of a problem.

> No, it really didn't because I didn't have any life outside of the university. I don't have any children and my husband and I were commuting and he didn't even live in the same state. He was on faculty at another university. So, I basically spent my, I spent from 7 in the morning until 9 or 10 at night everyday and weekends there. I didn't have any outside life.

A good fit

The mission and the values held throughout X University at times differed from those of our informants--influencing their decision to depart. One informant moved to her new position and left X University because she wanted

> a real active and pretty positive tension between research and practice and that was a creative sort of tension that was missing at X University. That is a big reason.

She illustrated by describing conditions at her new university.

> A very concrete example is that here we have two faculty tracks. A tenure track and what is called a track that allows progression up the academic latter for faculty who are primarily involved in professional practice, secondarily educators and occasionally have some research interests. That track exists simultaneously with the tenure track. It is not clearly defined as separate but equal. Nevertheless, there is that opportunity and we are moving towards that.

Though she had strong opinions akin to the other informant, another informant notes that her former university's values of practice/research had no influence on her decision to leave.

The informants expressing these feelings of 'misfit' are all in related professional fields--a point we must point out recognizing the influence of field on faculty experience. However, other informants in the same professional area have no problem with X University goals and cite other reasons for leaving.

A key reason another informant moved to a different higher education institution was because her new system "provides a much greater level of support to both undergrad and graduate students than does" the system she was formerly in. She felt the new system has an approach "superior from a philosophical standpoint" and values and provides a better infrastructure for higher education. However she still thinks X University was excellent and very supportive of women--her move "was definitely more 'pull' than 'push.'

Another informant notes that she spent more time with students than male peers but did it by choice even if the extra work was not recognized by her unit.

The idea of having the proper match with X University extend also to the issue of unit governance. One of our informants named her chairperson's management style as pushing her to depart. Another informant, who was also an administrator at X University, found faculty-administrative conflict troubling and, in part, left for a university where the two groups were more cooperative. At her former unit at X University

> Faculty could not come together on an issue, with a position on an issue. And they said that problem was due to lack of leadership and that was a problem of mine and not of ours. And the faculty and the chair and the chairs and the deans were seeing that and playing off against each other rather than working together ...

The 'pulled'

Using terms voiced by one of our informants, most of these departed faculty talked mostly about the 'push' within the environment of X University that convinced them to leave, rather than the 'pull' that attracted them to a new location. We conducted this study with the goal of learning why our informants left with the secondary hope of learning about the work environment at their former university. With our goal shaping how we asked questions, this attention to the environment of X University is what we expected. Each of our respondents told us about conditions at X University that they saw as less than perfect and which made it less attractive for them to work there. Yet two of our respondents differed from the others in their stories. They spoke more about moving to a new position for reasons beyond the control of X University. One gave her main reason as wishing to live in a country other than the U.S. The other noted her main reason as wanting to stay 'fresh' in her scholarship with new surroundings and colleagues. Both of these informants appear to be in

more of a 'pull' situation where reason they left had more to do with their new employer than their former. Unfortunately, the two 'pull' faculty were also informants with whom we had the least contact due to shortened interviews or modified surveying by mail. Nonetheless, their stories testify to the diversity of reasons that faculty leave.

We want to stress that our informants were 'pulled' and recruited by the prestigious institutions to which they went. Our informants are highly respected within their fields and their new institutions were pleased to have been able to employ them.

> it was wonderful to come to a place where people were just...couldn't stand the excitement of having gotten me.

One talked about the success she found while working at her new employer.

> I've had several of my male colleagues from X University tell me that I did the right thing in leaving when I did, because here I have the facilities so much better. And I am able to accomplish research and be ahead of the field. I never would have been able to do that at X University. My male friends from X University tell me this. So it is not that it is a personal thing. I always believe that I did the right thing in leaving, but I have had confirmation of that from several of my male friends who have just said, look you couldn't have done what you've done.

Our informants were not overly negative in their outlook on their careers. One woman told us she left in order to avoid anymore emotional turmoil.

> I left for still a third very personal reason. And that was that I believed that if I stayed there any longer I was going to become a very bitter woman. I did not want to become a bitter women. That's not my nature. And I must say I am very happy where I am. I have experienced no discrimination here. I have experienced a great deal of support for what I do. I am called upon [to serve an important role in national and international affairs in my field]. And nobody at X University has been one bit interested in me since I left. Which I think is the culminating criticism that I can give.

Another talks about her feelings about her thwarted attempts to advance at X University and then her decision to leave.

> ... I don't have any kind of bad feelings or bitterness or anything about not finding a different kind of career rung that I could climb at X University, because there are others available and luckily I found a good one.

In all, we heard a number of positive comments about the new employers of our informants.

> [Interviewer] When you decided to leave, is there anything that your colleagues or X University could have done to convince you to stay on?
> [Informant] No.
> [Interviewer] OK, so you were pretty sure that you were moving to a place where you really wanted to be.
> [Informant] I was, and a year later I am.

University response to those departing

Most of our informants told us a great deal about how X University responded to their needs for opportunities, respect, support, salary, dual career balance, and a good fit of interests.

Our informants also told us how X University officially responded to them in their final days on the faculty. We asked informants what X University could have done to keep them from leaving once they received outside job offers. The reasons that made our informants want to leave X University were more often aggravated than assuaged by the University's reaction to these women's decisions to consider outside job offers.

Four of our informants report that their unit did not make an effort to keep them at X University by offering an appropriate counteroffer. For an informant who was dissatisfied with the support she received during her career, this lack of support continued to be exhibited when she told her unit she was leaving.

> But, and indeed my unit chair kept making a lot of hollow promises, but what he would do is say, 'I will match.' I got a very excellent package when I left with a lot of things that were not made available even though I had asked for them over the years at X University. So he said, 'I will match that package exactly.' But he would not put it writing or go any further than to say, 'I will match and you will have to take my word for it but I promise you have my word that I will match it.' And I said, 'Well look. You are the guy who wouldn't support me during an earlier incident. So I can't... I would have to be pretty stupid to sit and believe that.'
> ...At this point at that point, by the time I got to that point, I didn't have just free trust for everybody around me. And so, had they really desired to do something to keep me there, they would have needed to do what you would do in any business situation and that is to put it in writing and not just, 'Oh take my word for it' kind-of-thing.
> ...But they didn't and in the long run I am sure that it doesn't make any difference to them if I am there or not, it doesn't bit of difference.

Another informant remarked

> There was absolutely no effort whatsoever. No one ever spoke to me or mentioned to me any desire of altering my plans. I don't think that I got any kind of note or anything from anybody at a higher level from the people in my department.

Another informant had to request it before her unit would make her a counteroffer. Then the lack of expediency in setting up the offer and the unit chairperson's inadequate communication with her, displayed to her that the lack of respect previously shown her was not going to improve enough for her to consider staying at X University .

Yet another informant could not get a counteroffer of a better salary in writing. She expressed her reaction that having the counteroffer would have given her a choice but even that could not guarantee that the reason she was leaving could be made up for.

> I don't know if they could have kept me. Yea, if I had had a really good salary there as I should have had. Now my friends around the country when they heard my salary, they would break into laughter and that kind of thing. X University's salaries are usually good. It is not like I am coming from an underpaid university generally. I am coming from one where generally people have quite good salaries. That rankled. And as I told my chairman, at least if I had had a really decent salary there would have been something to give up ...

A number of our informants told us that at the point they decided to leave, nothing could have been done to keep them. Yet this is not because they did not try to stay at X University. One woman who left because she saw no opportunities for herself at X University, spoke with

numerous other senior women at the University to try to figure out a way to advance and to stay.

> I really did not have, I did it for the possibility of what else could I do in terms of advancement or my career at X University. By speaking to some eminent women professors, by speaking to my chairman, and I really have a feeling that... well I was actually told by people, 'if you don't like it here you'll just have to leave.' And that was their only suggestion. And the thing that surprised me was that I made a conscious effort to see several of the very prominent women on the faculty, not only in my school. ... to sort of, for my own information to see whether that's really what I should do, or was I missing some link or steps that I could use in career advancement at X University. And the answers were very clear from everyone. That that's the way things were, and that's the way they're going to be and I myself.. and there was nothing I could do about it.

Looking at the language used by our informants, we are struck by the 'color' in the words and phrases used. For example, one informant reports that she was told to "go fly a kite" and that her concerns were answered with "this little set shpeel." Another talked about her department and school as entities that responded to her at various points of her career by 'not giving one tiddly-wink,' "just saying, 'kiss you goodbye,'" and letting her know "they don't give a damn." Another mentions more inaction than hostility. Interdepartmental communication was lacking and actions were not taken to make corrections. Another echoes this lack of attention to requests with the dangling phrase, "Well, he just sort of didn't...."

Former tenured women faculty members' response to the University
A university's reaction to the faculty that it loses also has impact after these faculty depart. The women from X University continue to affect the University's fund raising, reputation, and ability to hire new faculty. Development offices should take heed of comments like that from one of our informants.

> [In my new position] I am called upon .... to work with top national and international scholars and policy makers. And nobody at the University has been one bit interested in me since I left. Which I think is the culminating criticism that I can give. .... And frankly, I don't give any money to the University and I think that there should be some way women can combine in this effort. The only money that I give to the University ever is for things that pertain to women. I will not give money to X University for any other purpose. And I wish more women would react like that.

A university's reputation and the advice shared among professional groups plays an important role in efforts to attract the best new scholars. We asked our informants what they would tell a candidate for a job at X University if asked to give advice. One informant would hesitate to encourage a woman to move into her old department. She found the department to be intellectually excellent, but socially undesirable. Two would be complimentary, but one of these informants would add advice that career goals must match the institutional mission.

> My first response would be, 'gee it is a wonderful institution.' My second response would be to ask them what their career goals are and to explore the extent to which their goals matched my perception of the institution's goals. And that is probably, if someone that I didn't know came up, that is probably what I would do. All I would do.

Another departed faculty member has actively expressed her reservations to women thinking about faculty careers, especially at X University and would not recommend taking at position at the University.

> I have a daughter who just graduated and I encouraged her not to go into academic life. I encouraged her to look at something else, particularly because from my experience. I knew how women ... how they were not regarded well in her field. I knew that from my experience within X University. Again, the University was one of the few schools cited for not having any women in her field. That was in a journal I was reading. And I sent that off to the academic dean. I said, you know, this is kind of embarrassing to have the university as one of the few in the country cited this way.

Another informant talked of the women postdocs in her former unit, indicating that her experiences there had a negative impact on the next generation of potential faculty at X University.

> And I might add that all of the postdocs that were women there at the time felt the same way. None of them stayed on faculty there. I mean you could not have begged them to stay on. They feel very strongly even today about the lack of future for women in that department.

Yet despite unsatisfactory experiences at X University, she would offer a more neutral and positive view of the University if asked by others for advice on taking a position there.

> I wouldn't really say anything. I don't think that it is not, you know, because I had that experience there because I saw it wide spread in the system. Doesn't mean that I am going to tell another women not come to work there. I think that it is an individual thing. I think that my tolerance for it was probably a lot better than a lot of women's tolerance for it. And I am sure there are places where it is worse and I am absolutely certain there are places where it is better. I am not going to, no one... I don't think that I would ever try to give anybody advice about that aspect of it. If they asked me about the job I could tell them there are many wonderful things about X University..., at the administrative level at the very high up levels there is a lot of very futuristic thinking that makes it very exciting to work there. But I am not going to comment about the difficulties women have when they go there to another women because I think that is something that you personally have to work out yourself and that it also can't be generalized. University-wide there may be a certain policy, but within little areas it is going to be better or worse depending on the quality of your male colleagues. So for example, if the department chairmen changes the whole view is going to change.

Another informant echoed her views.

> I would tell them it is a relatively harsh environment, and that I really can't give them any precise, particular advice because there is a lot of ongoing changes that happen in the professional staff in my former school on an ongoing basis. And the conditions and procedures and visions and processes are changing all the time and it's depends on what point one enters this school at the university. If they're going to be associated with what has happened. I think in terms of progression in careers, the environment is not terribly hospitable.

Conclusion

Opportunity for significant contribution, respect for their scholarship and themselves as worthy of non prejudiced treatment, and support both from persons and materially were the unmet needs which contributed greatly to most of our informants decisions to leave X University. These unmet needs were manifested by common experiences including salary inequities and negotiations, dual career challenges and university reaction to their consideration of another job offer. The lack of a good fit between the informants interest and the goals of units or schools or university was an additional reason for some--especially for those in professional fields where professional practice comes into more conflict with basic research. Our informants cited gender as a primary underlying influence on these issues of opportunity, respect and support. Two of our informants left primarily for more positive reasons: they were pulled by their desire to move to new settings.

We see these findings as evidence that universities need to attend to the needs of their tenured women faculty to assure that they do not chose to leave as our informants did. An alternative view would be that our informants were not strong scholars and X University has nothing to remedy--that it is better for the University that they left. A number of points help to refute this view. One, these women moved to universities and research institutions with excellent reputations and into key leadership roles or higher ranks. Two, we do not believe our informants would lie when they report their credentials, i.e., winning awards, having their work included on qualifying exams in their field, etc.... Three, if these women were not contributors at X University, this speaks more poorly of X University's tenure system than of the individuals.

Another alternative explanation would be that our informants were simply 'too sensitive.' Some might say everyone, male and female, puts up with the type of treatment our informants did. Even if this is so it does not make it alright. For example, no one should have to put up with assumptions made about them as professionals that hinge on their marital status. Our informants note that the conditions, while bad for all faculty, were worse for women. It is also important to note that our informants stayed at X University for many years and worked to solve their problems.

Complementary findings: Survey responses of current tenured faculty

As a number of scholars say (e.g., Patton, 1990:329), quantitative and qualitative research usually works to answer different types of questions. This study is typical as the findings of our survey analysis addresses complementary, but not the same questions as our interviews. Using the Carnegie 1989 faculty survey data, we learn from the responses of men and women tenured faculty who talk about their employing universities. This analysis does not address why they left tenured positions. Rather, it addresses their satisfactions with their environment and whether they would consider leaving their current position.

The quantitative analysis offers some interesting insights related to differences in views of the national group of tenured women and men and influences on faculty thoughts on leaving. Table 1 shows the ANOVA results comparing tenured women's and men's beliefs and experiences. We find some clearly significant differences between tenured women and men; tenured women are younger, feel more stress and are less satisfied with their salary, their institution's efforts at affirmative action, and their teaching load. Though the statistical significance of the difference is not as clear, our findings also suggest that tenured women are slightly more likely to consider leaving their current position as seen by their score on the scale, I'M THINKING OF LEAVING. These findings suggest that our interview informants who relay stories of gender inequities are not rare exceptions--nationally, tenured women as a group are less satisfied than men in regard to salary and affirmative action efforts.

Table 1
Differences between women and men tenured faculty
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

Variable or scale /definition	Tenured women (alpha if scale)	Tenured men (alpha if scale)	Signif	* if < 0.01
I'M THINKING OF LEAVING	21.7467 (0.85)	22.5380 (0.86)	.0123	
MY YEAR OF BIRTH	40.0508	37.239	.0000	*
SATISFIED WITH SALARY (10=strong disagree)	5.9276 (0.75)	5.6933 (0.78)	.0090	*
AFFIRM ACTION IS GOOD /Institutional affirmative action program is good (10=strong disagree)	5.5845 (0.62)	4.6960 (0.54)	.0000	*
AFFIRM ACTION STRAINS /Affirmative action causing strains (5=strong disagree)	3.9088	3.9470	.5766	
RELAX STANDARDS /Academic requirements should be relaxed for affirm. action (5=strong disagree)	4.2353	4.3663	.0230	
DEMOCRATIC ADMIN /Administration at institution is (4=very democratic)	1.9786	2.0196	.3991	
INFLUENCE ON INSTIT /Opportunity to influence institution (4=none)	3.0484	3.0741	.5677	
NATURE OF DISCIPLINE /Faculty differ about discipline nature (5=strong disagree)	2.8710	2.7979	.3656	
DEPT REPUTATION /Academic reputation is (8=poor)	4.8150 (0.79)	4.8471 (0.79)	.7345	
TEACHING LOAD /My own teaching load (4=poor)	2.7124	2.4295	.0000	*
STRESSED OUT /I am stressed out (15=strong disagree)	8.3627 (0.69)	9.3280 (0.62)	.0000	*
POOR ADMIN /Administration at institution (4=poor)	2.9299	3.0345	.0395	
DEPT MORALE /Department morale (6=much worse)	4.0989	3.9639	.0709	

Table 2
For tenured women faculty
**** MULTIPLE REGRESSION **** Dependent Variable.. I'M THINKING OF LEAVING

Adjusted R Square .26646

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	Tolerance	V	I F	T	Sig T
MY YEAR OF BIRTH	.055021	.033375	.078052	.914061	1.0	94	1.649	.1001
SATISFIED WITH SALARY	-1.133372	.193357	-.289529	.839806	1.1	91	-5.862	.0000
AFFIRM ACTION IS GOOD	-.216705	.122884	-.086291	.855768	1.1	69	-1.763	.0787
AFFIRM ACTION STRAINS	.040593	.222668	.008715	.896499	1.1	15	.182	.8555
RELAX STANDARDS	.105749	.246040	.020080	.938789	1.0	65	.430	.6676
DEMOCRATIC ADMIN	.192600	.383148	.029715	.586367	1.7	05	.503	.6155
INFLUENCE ON INSTIT	-.707349	.372908	-.097009	.783383	1.2	77	-1.897	.0587
NATURE OF DISCIPLINE	.090140	.194852	.023379	.802234	1.2	47	.463	.6439
TEACHING LOAD	.076289	.303788	.012750	.794838	1.2	58	.251	.8019
STRESSED OUT	.478145	.091537	.262037	.814215	1.2	28	5.224	.0000
DEPT REPUTATION	-.552105	.176578	-.161865	.764541	1.3	08	-3.127	.0019
POOR ADMIN	.414709	.412533	.064625	.495800	2.0	17	1.005	.3155
DEPT MORALE	-.425230	.199393	-.104645	.851000	1.1	75	-2.133	.0337
(Constant)	27.362097	3.475829					7.872	.0000

Table 3
For tenured male faculty Random 30% sample...
**** MULTIPLE REGRESSION **** Dependent Variable.. I'M THINKING OF LEAVING

Adjusted R Square .23619

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	Tolerance	V	IF	T	Sig T
MY YEAR OF BIRTH	.049001	.028514	.067105	.965124	1.0	36	1.718	.0863
SATISFIED WITH SALARY	-.527005	.147733	-.153869	.791025	1.2	64	-3.567	.0004
AFFIRM ACTION IS GOOD	-.034859	.112976	-.012594	.883302	1.1	32	-.309	.7578
AFFIRM ACTION STRAINS	.306918	.192635	.064912	.886623	1.1	28	1.593	.1117
RELAX STANDARDS	-.146109	.227592	-.025338	.944782	1.0	58	-.642	.5212
DEMOCRATIC ADMIN	.713156	304638	.110105	.665292	1.5	03	2.341	.0196
INFLUENCE ON INSTIT	-.768472	.316813	-.107654	.747155	1.3	38	-2.426	.0156
NATURE OF DISCIPLINE	.327212	.163291	.082879	.860329	1.1	62	2.004	.0456
TEACHING LOAD	-.418468	.250043	-.070346	.832990	1.2	00	-1.674	.0948
STRESSED OUT	.415659	.075417	.223710	.893269	1.1	19	5.511	.0000
DEPT REPUTATION	-.070169	.133995	-.021569	.867504	1.1	53	-.524	.6007
POOR ADMIN	.005730	.294537	9.527E-04	.613712	1.6	29	.019	.9845
DEPT MORALE	-.623433	.175432	-.143106	.907542	1.1	02	-3.554	.0004
(Constant)	23.218359	2.703868					8.587	.0000

(Insert Tables 1, 2, 3)

Our regression analysis finds that faculty who are thinking more about leaving their position share a number of other views. Judging from Tables 2 and 3, tenured women who are likely to consider leaving academe are less satisfied with their salary, more likely to be stressed, and think that the reputation of their institution is poor. Tenured men who consider leaving also are dissatisfied with salary and are under strain. In addition, these male faculty think the morale in their department is on the decline. These factors explain about a quarter of the variance in how both women and men feel about leaving their position. These findings support that women and men who consider leaving may answer some questions in a similar fashion on this survey. Yet they also differ is some ways. More importantly, these findings also support our primary findings that faculty work environment is an appropriate place to look for factors influencing decisions faculty make in regard to leaving their positions.

Discussion: Why do they leave?

Our findings from exit interviews address our main research question, 'Why do tenured women leave?' Our informants confirmed our suspicion that there were aspects of the environment within which they worked that made them choose to leave. They described a number of experiences and incidences where their career opportunities were blocked, others treated them with disrespect, they got too little personal or financial support, salary was inequitable, the university did not help with dual career issues, personal and institutional goals were mismatched, and, in some cases, the university's response to them made matters worse. A significant number of these negative experiences were related to gender.

It is interesting to think of the reasons given by former tenured women for why they departed from X University as 'forces.' Using that analogy, the majority of our informants described situations to us where they experienced the 'push' of negative influences for years--perhaps knowing one is inequitably paid, dealing with frustrations in the lack of opportunities, the difficulty of living apart from a spouse. Yet something kept them, for a time, at X University despite these circumstances that they now name as causing their departure. They persisted and succeeded in their research, service and teaching. They were tenured and promoted. In looking at each case, there appears to be for the informants, a point where either the addition of 'push forces' (negative experiences within the university workplace that made them consider leaving) or 'pull forces' (positive aspects of another institution that attracted them to this new institution) or the subtraction of a 'retaining force' (aspects of X University that makes them want to stay) breaches the equilibrium and leads to their departure.

> It was just one of the millions of little things, that were all of the time constant things that were not equal in treatment but all of them did not make me leave because I had a lot of perseverance to stay in my job and to keep on. What finally made me leave, the final episode that just pushed me over the edge...

This study contributes by both elaborating on the existence of these forces and by naming some key needs of tenured women faculty that when not met can act as critical 'push forces'. Tenured women need opportunities, respect, support, fair salary, assistance with spouse's employment, a match between their interests and those of their university's, and to be responded to seriously when dealing with outside job offers.

Implications for research and practice

Research

Future research could examine our findings from a number of perspectives. To better explore influences that act as retaining forces, current or departed tenured women faculty could be asked through in depth interviews why they stay at an university. These informants could also be asked why they did or would consider moving to another university or institution. It is also especially important to learn about success stories of departments and universities where tenured women have opportunities, respect, support and their other needs met. Documenting successful policies can provide critical information to those hoping to make reforms at their own institutions.

While a number of former tenured women faculty name gender as an issue important in the factors that lead to their departures, the effect of gender on faculty experiences could be further explored by asking them directly how gender affected the factors causing them to leave. In addition, it would be intriguing to talk with former tenured men and ask them why they left. However, we feel it is particularly important to study women of all races/ethnicities and men of color. It is faculty in these groups who are underrepresented and whose experiences need to be better understood.

We conducted the survey analysis for a very limited purpose: to learn if it showed, on a more national level, gender differences and/or relationships between faculty views on the workplace and their thoughts on leaving. The analysis did serve this purpose. The survey findings give us support that our findings have some implications for tenured women at institutions other than X University. Additional studies need to look at other universities to learn how their unique environment affects their tenured women faculty. We think our findings give support that these additional institutional studies are needed.

Practice

One informant asked what we planned to do with the information gathered through this study.

> You know I asked that because I am curious generally and in part because I'm a pragmatist, because I always want to know what you are going to do with whatever. And in part because in my five years at X University I saw a number of excellent reports generated on a variety of issues and never attended to internally. I can't argue that X University, like any school, has a responsibility to higher ed generally. I would like to see some of what X University learns used for X University's' benefit. I sometimes question that.

We conducted this study, not just with the hopes of presenting conference papers or to help the situation of women faculty in general. Our findings most specifically are addressed to the leadership of X University. A report detailing the experiences reported by both tenured and untenured former faculty of that university will be provided to administrators there and to the women's center at that university.

We make a number of specific policy recommendations based on our findings.

First, university administrators, especially chairpersons and deans must be held accountable in fostering a climate of respect for all faculty. Our informants' stories note that disrespect while blatant at times can also be very covert. How can administrators shape these interactions between people? We recognize that it is not an easy task. Yet, we know of a number of actions that must be taken. The first step is for administrators to pay attention to this issue, placing on it the importance that it deserves. In addition, assessment by a

third party on a regular basis, can provide university and department leaders with the information they need to shape the climate. Formal and informal accountability are key. Colleagues must be willing to and supported when they say to offensive peers, 'this is not acceptable around here.' Those appointing administrators should consider candidates' records of fostering climates where all faculty succeed, especially women of all races/ethnicities and men of color.

In this study, we show that exit interviews conducted by a third-party interviewer can be a valuable tool for assessment. Providing assurance that the informants' identity will not be disclosed is the essential ingredient in the success of these interviews. We found almost no resistance to cooperating with these interviews. One informant even commented that at the time she left X University she wondered why they did not conduct exit interviews: "a standard practice in industry to track personnel attitudes and needs."

Second, tenured women faculty name a lack of opportunity and support as a major deterrents to their persistence. X University and other institutions need to address these concerns, especially in light of the underrepresentation of women in top leadership positions in universities. Universities will be well served to facilitate those who wish to contribute and grow in their service to their institution and field. Career paths and personal and financial support must be available equitably for women faculty. University leadership must assess these issues at their institutions and take action when needed.

Second, universities and schools should look carefully at how they approach negotiations with women faculty who have job offers from other institutions. Here again, accountability is the key: department chairpersons need to be held accountable for their actions or inaction in these negotiations. These negotiations help to shape the strength and composition of the university faculty. Institutions need to establish procedures that help assure gender equity in their negotiations.

Fourth, our informants made suggestions in regard to specific programs in need of attention. For example, at X University, programs that assist faculty with spousal employment need to be reexamined from the point of view of those for whom they failed. Our informants made suggestions on how to improve these programs--for example, using more aggressive follow-ups with spouses, introducing spouses to faculty in their fields who may have professional contacts to help in the job hunt and funding the hiring of spouses who seek faculty positions.

Fifth, salary equity should be reviewed on a regular basis. Our informants describe many examples of inequities while nationally, dissatisfaction with salary is more common to women tenured faculty than men. Assessment of salary issues is necessary but not sufficient. Action to remedy inequities found must be a commitment made by university leaders. Too often our informants told us that the inequities in salary were acknowledged by administrators who did nothing to fix them. The admission of gender inequitable salaries but lack of remedy--this is but one example of an institution's reaction or lack of action that constitute institutional sexism.

Finally, a number of our informants experienced gender discrimination and noted that the responses they received from their university when reporting discriminatory incidents was inadequate and sometimes punitive. The avenues available to women faculty who wish to report gender discrimination must be more widely visible and freed from the backlash and inaction that our informants report.

In sum, we recommend that X University and the higher education community attend to the issues important to their tenured women faculty. With so few tenured women, even the loss

and discouragement of a few can have grave impact on departments (who could be left with no women on the faculty), younger faculty (who could lose potential mentors and role models), and students (who could interact with very few women professors in their college years). A solution is not to be found in a continual hiring process in which women enter in one side of a revolving door and then exit out the other side. It is time for universities to take action to attend to the needs of those women who are currently in their midst.

References

Aisenberg, N. and Harrington, M. (1988). Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Amey, M.J. (1993). Institutional market places and faculty attrition: The realities for professors at one research university. Paper presented at 1993 American Educational Research Association annual conference, Atlanta, GA.

Barritt, L., Beekman, T., Bleeker, H. and Mulderij, K. (1985). Researching educational practice. Grand Forks, ND: University of North Dakota.

Boice, R. (1992). The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brannen, J. (1992). Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches: An overview. In J. Brannen (Ed.), Mixing methods: Qualitative and quantitative research. (pp. 3-37). Aldershot, England: Avebury.

Bryman, A. (1988). Quantity and quality in social research. London: Unwin Hyman.

Burke, D.L. (Spring 1987). The academic marketplace in the 1980s: Appointment and termination of assistant professors. The Review of Higher Education, 10(3), 199-214.

Caldwell, J.C. (1985). Strengths and limitations of the survey approach for measuring and understanding fertility change: Alternative possibilities. In J. Cleland and J. Hobcraft (Eds.), Reproductive change in developing countries: Insights for the World Fertility Survey. (pp. 45-63). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1989). Survey among college and university faculty. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carter, D.J., and Wilson, R. (1992). ,Minorities in higher education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Eisner, E.W. (1991). The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Feldt, B. (1985). An analysis of productivity of nontenured faculty women in the medical and a related school: Some preliminary findings based on the faculty cohort studies. Ann Arbor, MI: Office of Affirmative Action, University of Michigan.

Hollenshead, C. (1994). Faculty outcomes: Cohort study. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Jayratne, T. and Stewart, A. (1991). Quantitative and qualitative methods in the social sciences: Current feminist issues and practical strategies. In M.M. Fonow and J.A. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research. (pp. 85-106). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Jensen, K.. (1982). Women's work and academic culture: Adaptations and confrontations. Higher Education, 11. 67-83.

Johnsrud, L.K. and Wunsch, M. (December, 1991). Junior and senior faculty women: Commonalties and differences in perceptions of academic life. Psychological Reports, 69(3) Part I. 879-886.

Johnsrud, L.K., Atwater, C.D., Ikeda, K., and Goodman, M.J. (March 1993). University of Hawaii-Manoa 1989-90 Faculty cohorts: Do they differ from earlier cohorts?. Manoa, HI: Office of Academic Affairs, University of Hawaii.

Johnsrud, L.K., Atwater, C.D., Ikeda, K., and Goodman, M.J. (September 1991). Barriers to retention and tenure at UH-Manoa: The experiences of faculty cohorts 1982-1988. Manoa, HI: Office of Academic Affairs, University of Hawaii.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), Doing feminist research. London: Routledge.

Patton, M.O. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Rausch, D.K., Ortiz, B.P., Douthitt, R.A., and Reed, L.L. (Spring 1989). The academic revolving door: Why do women get caught? CUPA Journal, 1-16.

Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist methods in social research. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rothblum, E.D. (1988). Leaving the ivory tower: Factors contributing to women's voluntary resignation from academia. Frontiers, 10(2). p. 14-17.

Ruskus, J., Williamson, C.L., and Kelley, F.A. (1993). From a woman's point of view: Barriers and facilitators to success in science and engineering. Presented at the 1993 American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Atlanta, GA.

Solomon, L.C. (1978). Turnover of senior faculty in departments of social and physical science and engineering. Research in Higher Education, 8(4), 343-355.

Sorcinelli, M.D. (1993). The career development of pretenure faculty: An institutional study. Paper presented at the 1993 American Educational Research Association annual conference, Atlanta, GA.

Stecklein, J.E. and Lathrop, R.L. (1960). Faculty attraction and retention: Factors affecting faculty mobility at the University of Minnesota. Minneapolis, MN: Bureau of Institutional Research, University of Minnesota.

Vandell, K. and Fishbein, L. (1989). Women and tenure: The opportunity of a century. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women.

Weiler, W.C. (1985). Why do faculty members leave a university? Research in Higher Education, 23(3), 270-278.

Wolcott, H.F. (1992). Posturing in qualitative inquiry. In M.D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy, and J. Preissle (Eds.), The handbook of qualitative research in education. (pp. 4-52). San Diego: Academic Press.

Zeller, R.A. (1993). Combining qualitative and quantitative techniques to develop culturally sensitive measures. In D.G. Ostrow and R.C. Kessler (Eds.), Methodological issues in AIDS behavioral research. (pp. 95-116). New York: Plenum Press.

Appendix 1

Interview schedule:
Phone interviews with former tenured faculty women from X University

Interviewer introduces self--
Explain program I am affiliated with and that I am...
working on a study to understand the mobility of tenured women faculty

Invites to participate in study--
I learned that you have left the Y dept at X University in the last few years. Would you be willing to talk with me about your reasons for leaving and about your former employer--keeping in mind that the information that you share will be held in confidence and your identity protected?

_____Yes _____No

Sets up time for interview--
Is now a good time to talk or would you like to schedule a more convenient time. The interview should take about a half hour. When would be good time?

_____Set up a time if needed

The interview introduction--
Thanks for assisting us with this study. Be assured that our conversation will be held in strict confidence. You are free to stop the interview at any time or chose not to answer certain questions. Your identity will be disguised in any report of our findings. I would be pleased to share any written reports of our conversation if you would like.

If you do not have any objection, I would like to tape record our interview so that I can most accurately convey your story. No one besides me or possibly the research staff at my organization will listen to this tape. Your name will not be written on the tape. I can turn off the tape at any time you request. Would it be ok to tape this?

_____Yes _____No

General background questions--
You were at the Y department at X University for how long?_____

You left in what year? _____.

At the time you left, what rank did you hold?_____

What are you currently doing?_____

Main question with probes--

Why did you chose to leave X University?

[Allow informant to talk freely giving her own reasons. Probe to fully develop the reasons, but not to direct interview.}

[After informant has exhausted open discussion proceed to probe on these topics that have not been addressed.]

May lead with something like: Other women who have left tenured positions mention factors that influence their decision. I will run down some of these factors that you haven't talked about. Please comment on these factors on your work life at your former department and whether they played a role in your leaving.

- Resources--i.e., research facilities, research funds
- Income potential or salary
- Opportunity for professional growth, or promotion
- Workload--i.e., relative importance between teaching and research
- Interactions with chair or peers--i.e., exchanging information, offering encouragement, collaborating, acceptance of work, general climate
- Family issues or geographic preference
- Discrimination
- Others?

Other questions:

What would have had to change for you to have stayed at X University?
and
What could X University had done differently to keep you when you told them you were leaving?

Would you encourage/advise someone else to take a position at the Y dept?

Is there anything else that comes to mind that you think we should keep in mind as we try to better understand your decision to leave?

Conclusion:

THANKS! I will send you a short consent form to sign (for the Human Subjects Review Process).

Let me check that I have your correct address...

Do you have any further questions?